arXiv:1608.02020v1 [math.AP] 5 Aug 2016

Global well-posedness and scattering for the radial, defocusing, cubic wave equation with initial data in a critical Besov space

Benjamin Dodson

August 9, 2016

Abstract: In this paper we prove that the cubic wave equation is globally well - posed and scattering for radial initial data lying in $B^2_{1,1} \times B^1_{1,1}$. This space of functions is a scale invariant subspace of $\dot{H}^{1/2} \times \dot{H}^{-1/2}$.

1 Introduction

The cubic nonlinear wave equation in three dimensions,

$$u_{tt} - \Delta u = -u^3 = F(u), \qquad u(0,x) = u_0, \qquad u_t(0,x) = u_1, \qquad x \in \mathbf{R}^3, \quad (1.1)$$

has been a topic of recent interest in the study of dispersive partial differential equations. A solution to (1.1) has the Hamiltonian

$$E(u(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u(t,x)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int u_t(t,x)^2 dx + \frac{1}{4} \int u(t,x)^4 dx. \quad (1.2)$$

A solution to (1.1) also obeys the scaling symmetry that if $u(t,x)$ solves (1.1), then for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\lambda u(\lambda t, \lambda x) \quad (1.3)$$

solves (1.1) with initial data $(\lambda u_0(\lambda x), \lambda^2 u_1(\lambda x))$. In three dimensions this problem is called $\dot{H}^{1/2}$ - critical because the symmetry (1.3) preserves the $\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)$ norm of the initial data.

Using the arguments found in [2] one can show that the initial value problem (1.1) fails to be even locally well - posed for data lying in spaces less regular than $\dot{H}^{1/2} \times \dot{H}^{-1/2}$, that is, any space $\dot{H}^s \times \dot{H}^{s-1}$, $s < \frac{1}{2}$.

Definition 1.1 (Locally well - posed) *The initial value problem* (1.1) *is said to be locally well - posed on an open interval* $0 \in I \subset \mathbf{R}$ *in* $\dot{H}^s \times \dot{H}^{s-1}$ *if*

1. *A unique solution* $u \in L_t^\infty \dot{H}^s(I \times \mathbf{R}^3) \cap L_{t,loc}^4 L_x^4(I \times \mathbf{R}^3)$, $u_t \in L_t^\infty \dot{H}^{s-1}(I \times \mathbf{R}^3)$ *exists,*

2. u *is continuous in time,* $u \in C(I; \dot{H}^s(\mathbf{R}^3))$, $u_t \in C(I; \dot{H}^{s-1}(\mathbf{R}^3))$,

3. u *depends continuously on the initial data. That is, for any compact* $J \subset I$, *if* $\|u_0 - u_0^*\|_{\dot{H}^s} < \epsilon$ *and* $\|u_1 - u_1^*\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} < \epsilon$, *for some* $\epsilon(J) > 0$ *sufficiently small, then*

$$\|u^* - u\|_{L_{t,x}^4(J \times \mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u^* - u\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{H}^s(J \times \mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_t^* - u_t\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{H}^{s-1}(J \times \mathbf{R}^3)} \leq C(\epsilon), \tag{1.4}$$

where $C(\epsilon)$ *is a continuous function of* ϵ, $C(0) = 0$. u *is the unique solution with initial data* (u_0, u_1) *and* u^* *is the solution with initial data* (u_0^*, u_1^*).

Lemma 1.1 (1.1) *is locally well - posed in* $\dot{H}^s \times \dot{H}^{s-1}$ *for any* $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

Proof: See [11]. □

Clearly the results of [2] and [11] completely work out the local theory of the initial value problem (1.1).

For the global theory, an additional obstacle is the lack of a conserved Hamiltonian (like (1.2)) at the critical regularity. Indeed [8] showed that the energy - critical problem obtained either by changing $-u^3$ to $-u^5$ in (1.1) or by analyzing (1.1) in dimension four is globally well - posed. The proof argues by showing that the conserved energy cannot concentrate at the tip of a light cone.

Remark: The focusing case (replace $-u^3$ in (1.1) by u^5) is considerably more complicated. Focusing problems are not addressed at all in this paper, and so the interested reader will simply be referred to [9] and the references therein.

However, there is no known conserved quantity that controls the $\dot{H}^{1/2} \times \dot{H}^{-1/2}$ norm of a solution to (1.1). For the radial version of (1.1),

$$u_{tt} - u_{rr} - \frac{2}{r} u_r + u^3 = 0, \qquad u(0,x) = u_0, \qquad u_t(0,x) = u_1, \tag{1.5}$$

this is in fact the obstacle to proving that (1.1) is globally well - posed and scattering in $\dot{H}^{1/2} \times \dot{H}^{-1/2}$.

Theorem 1.2 *Suppose* $u_0 \in \dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)$, $u_1 \in \dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)$ *are radial functions, and* u *solves* (1.1) *on a maximal interval* $0 \in I \subset \mathbf{R}$ *with*

$$\sup_{t \in I} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_t(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} < \infty. \tag{1.6}$$

Then $I = \mathbf{R}$ *and the solution* u *scatters both forward and backward in time.*

Proof: See [4]. □

Definition 1.2 (Scattering) *A solution to* (1.1) *is said to scatter forward in time if there exist some* $u_0^+ \in \dot{H}^{1/2}$, $u_1^+ \in \dot{H}^{-1/2}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \|u(t) - S(t)(u_0^+, u_1^+)\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_t(t) - \partial_t S(t)(u_0^+, u_1^+)\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} = 0, \tag{1.7}$$

where $u(t) = S(t)(u_0, u_1)$ *is the solution to the linear wave equation*

$$u_{tt} - \Delta u = 0, \qquad u(0,x) = u_0, \qquad u_t(0,x) = u_1. \tag{1.8}$$

A solution to (1.1) *is said to scatter backward in time if there exist* $u_0^- \in \dot{H}^{1/2}$, $u_1^- \in \dot{H}^{-1/2}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{t\to-\infty} \|u(t) - S(t)(u_0^-, u_1^-)\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_t(t) - \partial_t S(t)(u_0^-, u_1^-)\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} = 0. \tag{1.9}$$

To compensate for the lack of a quantity that controls the $\dot{H}^{1/2} \times \dot{H}^{-1/2}$ norm, we will use the fact that the cubic exponent in (1.1) is the conformal exponent ($\frac{n+3}{n-1}$) in three dimensions. Working in hyperbolic coordinates [17] proved weighted Strichartz estimates that extended previous results of [6].

Also working in hyperbolic coordinates [13] was able to prove a scattering result for data lying in a weighted energy space. To do this [13] used a Morawetz estimate in hyperbolic space. [3] combined the result of [13] with the I - method, proving

Theorem 1.3 *Suppose there exists a positive constant* $\epsilon > 0$ *such that*

$$\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2+\epsilon}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \||x|^{2\epsilon} u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2+\epsilon}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq A < \infty, \tag{1.10}$$

and

$$\|u_1\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2+\epsilon}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \||x|^{2\epsilon} u_1\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2+\epsilon}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq A < \infty. \tag{1.11}$$

Then (1.1) *has a global solution and there exists some* $C(A,\epsilon) < \infty$ *such that*

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}} \int (u(t,x))^4 dx dt \leq C(A,\epsilon), \tag{1.12}$$

which proves that u scatters both forward and backward in time.

Remark: A straightforward application of the Strichartz estimates of [7] and [15] shows that

$$\|u\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} < \infty \tag{1.13}$$

is equivalent to scattering.

Notice that conditions (1.10) and (1.11) fall just short of lying in the critical Sobolev space $\dot{H}^{1/2} \times \dot{H}^{-1/2}$, and are not invariant under the scaling (1.3). In this paper we will study the radial, nonlinear wave equation in three dimensions,

$$u_{tt} - u_{rr} - \frac{2}{r} u_r + u^3 = 0, \qquad u_0 \in B^2_{1,1}, \qquad u_1 \in B^1_{1,1}. \tag{1.14}$$

The Besov spaces $B^s_{q,r}$ will be defined in the next section. By the Sobolev embedding theorem, this space is a subspace of $\dot{H}^{1/2} \times \dot{H}^{-1/2}$, and the norm is invariant under (1.3).

The author believes that this is the first result in which large data scattering was proved for initial data in a scale - invariant space for which the norm was not controlled by a conserved quantity.

Theorem 1.4 *The initial value problem* (1.1) *is globally well - posed and scattering for* $u_0 \in B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)$*, radial, and* $u_1 \in B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)$*, radial. Moreover,*

$$\|u\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^3)} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}}, \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}}). \tag{1.15}$$

The proof of this theorem utilizes the fact that the free solution with such initial data is only singular at the origin $t = 0$, $x = 0$. Thus, using a Gronwall - type inequality, the local solution to (1.1) can be extended to a global solution that is the sum of a solution to the free wave equation combined with a finite energy term. A Morawetz estimate in hyperbolic coordinates then proves scattering.

The proof of theorem 1.4 will occupy the remainder of this paper. In section two we will begin by defining the Besov spaces and recalling basic Strichartz estimates. Then in section three the local theory of (1.1) will be discussed. Global well - posedness will then be proved in section four. In section five we will switch to hyperbolic coordinates to prove scattering. Finally in section six we will use a profile decomposition to show that the bounds obtained for any $u_0 \in B^2_{1,1}$, $u_1 \in B^1_{1,1}$ depend only on size.

2 Besov spaces and linear estimates

In this section we present some harmonic analysis estimates that will be used in this paper. None of these results are new.

Theorem 2.1 (Hardy - Littlewood - Sobolev inequality) *For any* $0 < s < 1$*, if* $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{p} + s - 1$*, then*

$$\| \frac{1}{|t|^s} * F(t) \|_{L^q(\mathbf{R})} \lesssim_s \|F\|_{L^q(\mathbf{R})}. \tag{2.1}$$

Definition 2.1 (Littlewood - Paley decomposition) *Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^3)$ be a function supported on $|x| \leq 2$ and $\phi(x) = 1$ for $|x| \leq 1$. Then for any $j \in \mathbf{Z}$ let*

$$P_j f = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\phi(2^{-j}\xi)\hat{f}(\xi)), \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$\hat{f}(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int e^{-ix\cdot\xi} f(x) dx, \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1} g = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int e^{ix\cdot\xi} g(\xi) d\xi. \tag{2.4}$$

Then for any Schwartz function f,

$$f = \sum_{j \in \mathbf{Z}} P_j f. \tag{2.5}$$

Let $K_j(x)$ be the kernel of the Littlewood - Paley multiplier P_j. Then by direct computation, for any N,

$$|K_j(x)| \lesssim_{d,N} \frac{2^{jd}}{(1 + 2^j|x|)^N}. \tag{2.6}$$

Since K_j has an L^1 norm that is uniformly bounded in j, for any $1 \leq p \leq \infty$,

$$\|P_j f\|_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim_d \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)}. \tag{2.7}$$

A direct computation also gives Bernstein's inequality

$$\|P_j f\|_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim_d 2^{-j} \|\nabla f\|_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)}, \tag{2.8}$$

along with the Sobolev embedding estimate, for $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$,

$$\|P_j f\|_{L^q(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim_d 2^{jd(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)}. \tag{2.9}$$

The Littlewood - Paley decomposition is foundational to the definition of Besov spaces.

Definition 2.2 (Besov spaces) *Suppose $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, and $s \in \mathbf{R}$. Then*

$$\|f\|_{B^s_{r,p}(\mathbf{R}^d)} = (\sum_{j \in \mathbf{Z}} 2^{jsr} \|P_j f\|^r_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)})^{1/r} \tag{2.10}$$

The Besov space $B^s_{r,p}$ is then the completion of the Schwartz space under this norm. $B^s_{r,p}$ is a Banach space under this topology.

The Besov spaces are well - behaved with respect to multiplying by smooth cutoff functions.

Lemma 2.2 *Suppose* $\chi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^3)$. *Then*

$$\|\chi(x)u\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}(\mathbf{R}^3)}, \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$\|\chi(x)u\|_{B^{-1/2}_{1,2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u\|_{B^{-1/2}_{1,2}(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{2.12}$$

Also if $\chi(x) = 1$ *on* $|x| \leq 1$ *then if* $u_0 \in B^2_{1,1}$ *and* $u_1 \in B^1_{1,1}$, *then*

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \|(1-\chi(\frac{x}{R}))u_0\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|(1-\chi(\frac{x}{R}))u_1\|_{B^{-1/2}_{1,2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} = 0. \tag{2.13}$$

Proof: Splitting

$$P_j(\chi f) = \chi(P_j f) + [P_j, \chi]f, \tag{2.14}$$

since by Holder's inequality,

$$\sum_j 2^{j/2}\|\chi(P_j f)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sum_j 2^{j/2}\|P_j f\|_{L^2}, \tag{2.15}$$

it remains to compute

$$\sum_j 2^{j/2}\|[P_j, \chi]f\|_{L^2}. \tag{2.16}$$

By (2.6) and the fundamental theorem of calculus,

$$\int K_j(x-y)[\chi(y)f(y)-\chi(x)f(y)] \lesssim \sum_k \int |K_j(x-y)||x-y||P_k f(y)|dy, \tag{2.17}$$

and therefore by Bernstein's inequality and (2.6),

$$\sum_{j\geq 0} 2^{j/2}\|P_j(\chi P_{\geq 0} f)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sum_{j\geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \sum_{k\geq 0} 2^{-k/2}\|P_k f\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} + \sum_j 2^{j/2}\|P_j f\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} \lesssim \|f\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}}. \tag{2.18}$$

Also by Bernstein's inequality, the Sobolev embedding theorem, and Hölder's inequality,

$$\sum_{j\geq 0} 2^{j/2}\|P_j(\chi P_{\leq 0} f)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla(\chi(P_{\leq 0} f))\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}}. \tag{2.19}$$

Similarly,

$$\|P_{\le 0}(\chi(P_{\le 0}f))\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}} \lesssim \|P_{\le 0}f\|_{L^6} \lesssim \|f\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}}. \tag{2.20}$$

Finally,

$$\|P_{\le 0}(\chi(P_{\ge 0}f))\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}} \lesssim \sum_{k\ge 0} 2^{-k/2}\|P_k f\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} \lesssim \|f\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}}. \tag{2.21}$$

Combining (2.18) - (2.21), we have proved

$$\|\chi f\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|f\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{2.22}$$

Also observe that (2.18) - (2.21) also imply that

$$\|\chi f\|_{B^{1/2}_{\infty,2}} \lesssim \|f\|_{B^{1/2}_{\infty,2}}, \tag{2.23}$$

and therefore by duality

$$\|\chi g\|_{B^{-1/2}_{1,2}} \lesssim \|g\|_{B^{-1/2}_{1,2}}. \tag{2.24}$$

To prove (2.13) observe that $B^{1/2}_{1,2} \times B^{-1/2}_{1,2}$ is invariant under the scaling (1.3), that is,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(1-\chi(\frac{x}{R}))u_0\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}} + \|(1-\chi(\frac{x}{R}))u_1\|_{B^{-1/2}_{1,2}} \\ &= R\|(1-\chi(x))u_0(Rx)\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}} + R^2\|(1-\chi(x))u_1(Rx)\|_{B^{-1/2}_{1,2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

The dominated convergence theorem, (2.19), and (2.20) imply that

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} R\|(1-\chi(x))P_{\le 0}(u_0(Rx))\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}} + R^2\|(1-\chi(x))P_{\le 0}(u_1(Rx))\|_{B^{-1/2}_{1,2}} = 0. \tag{2.26}$$

Meanwhile, (2.18), (2.21), and the dominated convergence theorem imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{R\to\infty} R\|(1-\chi(x))P_{\ge 0}(u_0(Rx))\|_{B^{1/2}_{1,2}} + R^2\|(1-\chi(x))P_{\ge 0}(u_1(Rx))\|_{B^{-1/2}_{1,2}} \\ &= \lim_{R\to\infty} R\sum_{j\ge 0} 2^{j/2}\|(1-\chi(x))P_j(u_0(Rx))\|_{L^2} + R^2\sum_{j\ge 0} 2^{-j/2}\|(1-\chi(x))P_j(u_1(Rx))\|_{L^2} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

□

Theorem 2.3 (Radial Sobolev embedding theorem) *For any j,*

$$\||x|P_j f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|P_j f\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{2.28}$$

Proof: By stationary phase computations, if f is radial then

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) = \int_0^\infty |\xi|^2 \hat{f}(|\xi|) \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} e^{i|x||\xi|\sin\theta} \cos\theta d\theta d|\xi| \\ = \int_0^\infty r^2 \hat{f}(r) \int_{-1}^1 e^{i|x|ru} du dr = \frac{1}{i|x|} \int_0^\infty \hat{f}(r) r [e^{i|x|r} - e^{-i|x|r}] dr. \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

The theorem then follows by the one dimensional Sobolev embedding theorem $B^{1/2}_{1,2}(\mathbf{R}) \subset L^\infty(\mathbf{R})$. $\square$

Now observe that the solution to the free wave equation

$$u_{tt} - \Delta u = 0, \qquad u(0,x) = f(x), \qquad u_t(0,x) = g(x), \tag{2.30}$$

is given by the Fourier multiplier

$$u(t,x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\cos(t|\xi|)\hat{f}(\xi) + \frac{\sin(t|\xi|)}{|\xi|}\hat{g}(\xi)) = S(t)(f,g). \tag{2.31}$$

Then the solution to

$$u_{tt} - \Delta u = F, \qquad u(0,x) = f(x), \qquad u_t(0,x) = g(x), \tag{2.32}$$

is given by

$$S(t)(f,g) + \int_0^t S(t-\tau)(0,F) d\tau. \tag{2.33}$$

Remark: Sometimes, if $u = S(t)(f,g)$ it is convenient to write

$$(u(t), \partial_t u(t)) = S(t)(f,g). \tag{2.34}$$

By standard stationary phase calculations,

Theorem 2.4 (Dispersive estimate)

$$\|S(t)(f,g)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \frac{1}{t}[\|\nabla^2 f\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|\nabla g\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}]. \tag{2.35}$$

The dispersive estimates can be used to prove Strichartz estimates.

Theorem 2.5 *Let $I \subset \mathbf{R}$, $t_0 \in I$, be an interval and let u solve the linear wave equation*

$$u_{tt} - \Delta u = F, \qquad u(t_0) = u_0, u_t(t_0) = u_1. \tag{2.36}$$

Then we have the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u\|_{L_t^p L_x^q(I\times\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{H}^s(I\times\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_t\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{H}^{s-1}(I\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \\ &\lesssim_{p,q,s,\tilde{p},\tilde{q}} \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^s(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|F\|_{L_t^{\tilde{p}'} L_x^{\tilde{q}'}(I\times\mathbf{R}^3)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

whenever $s \geq 0$, $2 \leq p, \tilde{p} \leq \infty$, $2 \leq q, \tilde{q} < \infty$, *and*

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \qquad \frac{1}{\tilde{p}} + \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} \leq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{2.38}$$

Proof: See for example [16]. □

Remark: This theorem can easily be combined with the Christ - Kiselev lemma (see [14]) and the fact that $|\nabla|$ commutes with the operator $(\partial_{tt} - \Delta)$ to prove many additional estimates.

Lemma 2.6 (Perturbation lemma) *Let* $I \subset \mathbf{R}$ *be a time interval. Let* $t_0 \in I$, $(u_0, u_1) \in \dot{H}^{1/2} \times \dot{H}^{-1/2}$ *and some constants* M, A, $A' > 0$. *Let* $\tilde{u}$ *solve the equation*

$$(\partial_{tt} - \Delta)\tilde{u} = F(\tilde{u}) = e, \tag{2.39}$$

on $I\times\mathbf{R}^3$, *and also suppose* $\sup_{t\in I} \|(\tilde{u}(t), \partial_t \tilde{u}(t))\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}\times\dot{H}^{-1/2}} \leq A$, $\|\tilde{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^4(I\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq M$,

$$\|(u_0 - \tilde{u}(t_0), u_1 - \partial_t \tilde{u}(t_0))\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}\times\dot{H}^{-1/2}} \leq A', \tag{2.40}$$

and

$$\|e\|_{L_{t,x}^{4/3}(I\times\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|S(t-t_0)(u_0 - \tilde{u}(t_0), u_1 - \partial_t\tilde{u}(t_0))\|_{L_{t,x}^4(I\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq \epsilon. \tag{2.41}$$

Then there exists $\epsilon_0(M, A, A')$ *such that if* $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ *then there exists a solution to* (1.1) *on* I *with* $(u(t_0), \partial_t u(t_0)) = (u_0, u_1)$, $\|u\|_{L_{t,x}^4(I\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq C(M, A, A')$, *and for all* $t \in I$,

$$\|(u(t), \partial_t u(t)) - (\tilde{u}(t), \partial_t\tilde{u}(t))\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}\times\dot{H}^{-1/2}} \leq C(A, A', M)(A' + \epsilon). \tag{2.42}$$

Proof: The method of proof is by now fairly well - known. See for example lemma 2.20 of [10]. □

3 Local theory

By the dominated convergence theorem, for any $u_0 \in B_{1,1}^2$, $u_1 \in B_{1,1}^1$, and $\delta > 0$ there exists some $j_0(\delta) < \infty$ such that

$$\sum_{j\geq j_0} 2^{2j} \|P_j u_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \sum_{j\geq j_0} 2^j \|P_j u_1\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} < \delta. \tag{3.1}$$

Then by the rescaling (1.3) with $\lambda = 2^{-j}$,

$$\sum_{j\geq 0} 2^{2j}\|P_j u_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \sum_{j\geq 0} 2^j \|P_j u_1\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} < \delta. \tag{3.2}$$

Lemma 3.1 *Fix $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small. There exists some $\delta(\epsilon, \|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}}, \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}}) > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \epsilon, \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty_t B^{1/2}_{1,2}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim 1. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof: Assume that (3.2) holds for some $\delta_1 << \epsilon_0$. By the Sobolev embedding theorem and definition 2.2,

$$\|S(t)(P_{\leq 0}u_0, P_{\leq 0}u_1)\|_{L^4_x(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim 1, \tag{3.5}$$

while by theorem 2.5, (3.1), and (3.2),

$$\|S(t)(P_{\geq 0}u_0, P_{\geq 0})\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \delta_1. \tag{3.6}$$

Taking $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, (3.5) and (3.6) imply that

$$\|S(t)(u_0, u_1)\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \epsilon_0. \tag{3.7}$$

Then by the contraction mapping principle and theorem 2.5,

$$\|u\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|S(t)(u_0,u_1)\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u\|^3_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}, \tag{3.8}$$

which when $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small implies

$$\|u\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \epsilon_0. \tag{3.9}$$

Next observe that by theorem 2.5 we also have

$$\||\nabla|^{1/4}u\|_{L^8_t L^{8/3}_x([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} + \||\nabla|^{-1/4}u\|_{L^{8/3}_t L^8_x([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \epsilon_0, \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_j u\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|P_j u\|_{L^\infty_t \dot{H}^{1/2}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} &\lesssim \|P_j u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|P_j u_1\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \\ +2^{-j/2} \sum_{j_1\leq j_2\leq j-5} \sum_{j-3\leq j_3\leq j+3} &\|P_{j_1}\|_{L^{8/3}_t L^8_x([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \|P_{j_2}u\|_{L^{8/3}_t L^8_x([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \|P_{j_3}u\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \\ +2^{j/4} \sum_{j-5\leq j_1\leq j_2\leq j_3} &\|P_{j_1}u\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \|P_{j_2}u\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \|P_{j_3}u\|_{L^8_t L^{8/3}_x([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)},\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

so then by (3.9) and (3.10),

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_j \|P_j u\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|P_j u\|_{L^\infty_t \dot{H}^{1/2}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \\ \lesssim \sum_j \|P_j u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} &+ \|P_j u_1\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \epsilon_0^2 \sum_j \|P_j u\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

which also implies

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty_t B^{1/2}_{1,2}([-\delta,\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{3.13}$$

□

Next suppose $\chi(x)$ is a smooth function that is supported on $|x| \leq 1$ and is equal to one on $|x| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. By lemma 2.2 there exists some $R(u_0, u_1, \epsilon)$ such that

$$\|(1-\chi(\frac{x}{R}))u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|(1-\chi(\frac{x}{R}))u_1\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq \epsilon. \tag{3.14}$$

Remark: Notice that R depends on u_0 and u_1, not just their size. We will remove this dependence when making a profile decomposition. Then another application of the scaling symmetry (1.3), this time with $\lambda = 2R$ implies

$$\|P_{>2R} u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|P_{>2R} u_1\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq \epsilon, \tag{3.15}$$

$$\|(1-\chi(2x))u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|(1-\chi(2x))u_1\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq \epsilon, \tag{3.16}$$

$$\|u\|_{L^4_{t,x}([-\frac{\delta}{2R},\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \epsilon_0, \tag{3.17}$$

and finally

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty_t B^{1/2}_{1,2}([-\frac{\delta}{2R},\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{3.18}$$

The next step is to show that this local solution has a singularity that is isolated in a suitable sense. Observe that the dispersive estimates imply that the linear wave equation $u_{tt} - \Delta u = 0$ with initial data (u_0, u_1) lies in L^∞ when $t > 0$. Indeed,

$$\|S(t)(u_0,u_1)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \frac{1}{t}\sum_j [2^{2j}\|P_j u_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} + 2^j \|P_j u_1\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}] \lesssim \frac{1}{t}[\|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)}]. \tag{3.19}$$

Interpolating (3.19) with Bernstein's inequality, for any j,

$$\|S(t)(P_j u_0, P_j u_1)\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \frac{2^{-j/6}}{t^{2/3}}[2^{2j}\|P_j u_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} + 2^j \|P_j u_1\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}], \tag{3.20}$$

while by the Sobolev embedding theorem $\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)$,

$$\|S(t)P_j(u_0,u_1)\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim 2^{j/2}[2^{2j}\|P_j u_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} + 2^j\|P_j u_1\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}], \qquad (3.21)$$

so then by direct computation

$$\sup_{t>0} t^{1/2}\|S(t)(u_0,u_1)\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|S(t)(u_0,u_1)\|_{L_t^2 L_x^6(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \qquad (3.22)$$

Lemma 3.2 *If $\delta > 0$ is given by the local result in lemma 3.1 for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$, then*

$$\sup_{-\frac{\delta}{2R}<t<\frac{\delta}{2R}} t^{1/2}\|u\|_{L_x^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u\|_{L_t^2 L_x^6([-\frac{\delta}{2R},\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \qquad (3.23)$$

Proof: By the dispersive estimates (theorem 2.4), the Hardy - Littlewood - Sobolev inequality, and interpolation

$$\|\int_0^t S(t-\tau)F(u(\tau))d\tau\|_{L_t^2 L_x^6([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \||\nabla|^{1/3}F(u)\|_{L_{t,x}^{6/5}([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}$$
$$\lesssim \||\nabla|^{1/2}u\|^{2/3}_{L_t^\infty L_x^2([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}\|u\|^{4/3}_{L_{t,x}^4([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}\|u\|_{L_t^2 L_x^6([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \epsilon_0^{4/3}\|u\|_{L_t^2 L_x^6([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}. \qquad (3.24)$$

Combining (3.24) with (3.22) proves

$$\|u\|_{L_t^2 L_x^6([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \qquad (3.25)$$

Next let $c > 0$ be a small constant to be determined later. Again by theorem 2.4, the Hardy - Littlewood - Sobolev inequality, and interpolation,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]} t^{1/2}\|\int_0^{(1-c)t} S(t-\tau)F(u(\tau))d\tau\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \frac{1}{c^{1/2}}\||\nabla|^{1/3}F(u)\|_{L_{t,x}^{6/5}([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}$$
$$\lesssim \frac{1}{c^{1/2}}\||\nabla|^{1/2}u\|^{2/3}_{L_t^\infty L_x^2([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}\|u\|^{4/3}_{L_{t,x}^4([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}\|u\|_{L_t^2 L_x^6([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}$$
$$\lesssim \frac{\epsilon_0^{4/3}}{c^{1/2}}(\|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)}). \qquad (3.26)$$

Also for any $t \in [0, \frac{\delta}{2R}]$, by theorem 2.4,

$$t^{1/2}\| \int_{(1-c)t}^{t} S(t-\tau)F(u(\tau))d\tau\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim (\sup_{t\in[0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]} t^{1/2}\|u(t)\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)})^{5/3} \||\nabla|^{1/2}u\|^{2/3}_{L_t^\infty L_x^2([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}$$
$$\times \|u\|^{2/3}_{L_t^\infty L_x^3([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \cdot \int_{(1-c)t}^{t} \frac{1}{(t-\tau)^{2/3}}\frac{1}{t^{1/3}}d\tau \lesssim c^{1/3}(\sup_{t\in[0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]} t^{1/2}\|u(t)\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)})^{5/3}. \tag{3.27}$$

Therefore,

$$\|u\|_{L_t^2 L_x^6([0,\frac{\delta}{2R}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} + \sup_{0<t<\delta} t^{1/2}\|u(t)\|_{L^6} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{3.28}$$

Then by time reversal symmetry the proof of lemma 3.2 is complete. □

Next, we show that a local solution may be written as a sum of a term with bounded energy and a term with good dispersive properties. To simplify notation let $\delta_1 = \frac{\delta}{2R}$. By energy inequalities, Strichartz estimates (theorem 2.5), and lemma 3.2,

$$\| \int_{\frac{\delta_1}{10}}^{\delta_1} S(t-\tau)F(u(\tau))d\tau\|_{\dot{H}^1\times L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u\|^3_{L_t^3 L_x^6([\frac{\delta_1}{10},\delta]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta_1^{1/2}}. \tag{3.29}$$

Next, by the radial Sobolev embedding theorem (theorem 2.3) and (3.13), if $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^3)$ is supported on $|x| \le 1$, $\chi(x) = 1$ on $|x| \le \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(1-\chi(\frac{10x}{\delta_1}))F(u)\|_{L_t^1 L_x^2([0,\frac{\delta_1}{10}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \\ &\lesssim \delta_1^{1/2}\|(1-\chi(\frac{10x}{\delta_1}))u\|_{L^\infty_{t,x}([0,\frac{\delta_1}{10}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}\|u\|^2_{L^4_{t,x}([0,\frac{\delta_1}{10}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta_1^{1/2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

Now for $t > \delta_1$ let

$$v(t) = S(t)\chi(\frac{10x}{\delta})(u_0,u_1) + \int_0^{\delta/10} S(t-\tau)\chi(\frac{10x}{\delta})F(u(\tau))d\tau. \tag{3.31}$$

Combining lemma 2.2 with

$$\|[P_j,\chi]F(u)\|_{L_t^1\dot{H}^{-1/2}([-\frac{\delta_1}{10},\frac{\delta_1}{10}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim 2^{-j}\delta_1^{-1}\|F(u)\|_{L_t^1 L_x^{3/2}([-\frac{\delta_1}{10},\frac{\delta_1}{10}]\times\mathbf{R}^3)}, \tag{3.32}$$

lemma 3.2,

$$\|P_{\le 0}\chi(\frac{10x}{\delta_1})F(u)\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u\|^3_{L_x^3(\mathbf{R}^3)}, \tag{3.33}$$

(3.10) - (3.13), the sharp Huygens principle, which implies v is supported on $\{(x,t) : ||x| - t| \leq \frac{\delta_1}{2}\}$, and the radial Sobolev embedding theorem (theorem 2.3),

$$\|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \frac{1}{t}[\|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)}]. \tag{3.34}$$

This implies good properties of $S(t-\delta_1)(v(\delta_1), v_t(\delta_1))$.

Lemma 3.3 *Let $w(\delta_1) + v(\delta_1) = u(\delta_1)$. Then*

$$w(\delta_1) = S(\delta_1)(1-\chi(\frac{10x}{\delta_1}))(u_0,u_1) + \int_0^{\frac{\delta_1}{10}} S(\delta_1-\tau)(1-\chi(\frac{10x}{\delta_1}))F(u(\tau))d\tau + \int_{\frac{\delta_1}{10}}^{\delta_1} S(\delta_1-\tau)F(u(\tau))d\tau, \tag{3.35}$$

and

$$\|w(\delta_1)\|_{\dot{H}^1\times L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \delta_1^{-1/2}. \tag{3.36}$$

Proof: By (3.30) and (3.31) it only remains to compute

$$\|(1-\chi(\frac{10x}{\delta_1}))u_0\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|(1-\chi(\frac{10x}{\delta_1}))u_1\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{3.37}$$

First,

$$|u_1(0,r)| \lesssim \int_r^\infty |\partial_r u_1(0,s)|ds \lesssim \frac{1}{r^2}, \tag{3.38}$$

so

$$\int_{\frac{\delta_1}{10}}^\infty |u_1(r,0)|^2 r^2 dr \lesssim \int_{\frac{\delta_1}{10}}^\infty |u_1(r,0)|dr \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta_1}. \tag{3.39}$$

Next, for any j, by the Sobolev embedding theorem,

$$\int_0^{2^{-j}} \frac{r^2}{r}|\partial_r(P_j u_0)|dr \lesssim 2^{2j}\|P_j u_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}, \tag{3.40}$$

while by Bernstein's inequality

$$\int_{2^{-j}}^\infty \frac{r^2}{r}|\partial_r(P_j u_0)|dr \lesssim 2^{2j}\|P_j u_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{3.41}$$

Therefore, $\|\frac{1}{r}\partial_r u_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)}$, and since u_0 is radially symmetric $\Delta u_0 = (\partial_{rr} + \frac{2}{r}\partial_r)u_0$, so $\|\partial_{rr}u_0\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)}$. By the fundamental theorem of calculus,

$$|u_r(0,r)| \leq \int_r^\infty |u_{rr}(0,s)|ds \lesssim \frac{1}{r^2}. \tag{3.42}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{\frac{\delta_1}{10}}^{\infty} |u_r(0,r)|^2 r^2 dr \lesssim \int_{\frac{\delta_1}{10}}^{\infty} |u_r(0,r)| dr \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta_1}, \tag{3.43}$$

and

$$\int_0^{\infty} (u_r(r))^2 r^3 dr \leq \int_0^{\infty} (\int_r^{\infty} |u_{rr}(s)| ds) r dr \lesssim \int_0^{\infty} |u_{rr}(s)| s^2 ds < \infty. \tag{3.44}$$

□

4 Proof of global well - posedness

In this section we extend local well - posedness to global well - posedness, proving

Theorem 4.1 (1.1) *is globally well - posed, and for any compact interval* $J \subset \mathbf{R}$*,*

$$\|u\|_{L^4_{t,x}(J \times \mathbf{R}^3)} < \infty. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof: By time reversal symmetry, to prove this it suffices to show that the local well - posedness result of lemma 3.1 can be extended to all times $t > \delta_1$. Throughout the proof the implicit constant depends on δ_1 and $\|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}} + \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}}$. Now for $t > \delta_1$ let

$$u(t) = w(t) + v(t), \tag{4.2}$$

where $v(t)$ is given by (3.31) and w solves

$$w_{tt} - \Delta w = -u^3. \tag{4.3}$$

Next, copying (1.2) let $E(w(t))$ be the energy of w,

$$E(w(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla w(t,x)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int (w_t(t,x))^2 dx + \frac{1}{4} \int (w(t,x))^4 dx. \tag{4.4}$$

By (3.18), (3.36), and the Sobolev embedding theorem $w \in L^3 \cap L^6$, so

$$E(w(\delta_1)) \lesssim 1. \tag{4.5}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} E(w(t)) &= \int ((w(t,x))^3 - (u(t,x))^3) w_t(t,x) dx \\ &= -\int w_t(t,x)[(v(t,x))^3 + 3v(t,x)^2 w(t,x) + 3v(t,x) w(t,x)^2] dx. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Now by (3.34),

$$\int w_t(t,x)(w(t,x))^2 v(t,x)dx \lesssim \|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^3)}\|w(t)\|^2_{L^4(\mathbf{R}^3)}\|w_t(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \frac{1}{t}E(w(t)). \tag{4.7}$$

$$\int w_t(t,x)(v(t,x))^3 dx \lesssim \|w_t(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)}\|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^3)}\|v(t)\|^2_{L^4(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \frac{1}{t}E(w(t))^{1/2}\|v(t)\|^2_{L^4(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{4.8}$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned}\int w_t(t,x)v(t,x)^2 w(t,x)dx &\lesssim \|w_t(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)}\|w(t)\|_{L^4(\mathbf{R}^3)}\|v(t)\|_{L^4(\mathbf{R}^3)}\|v(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^3)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{t}E(w(t))^{3/4}\|v(t)\|_{L^4(\mathbf{R}^3)}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Then by interpolation

$$\frac{d}{dt}E(w(t)) \lesssim \frac{1}{t}E(w(t)) + \frac{1}{t}\|v(t)\|^4_{L^4(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{4.10}$$

By Strichartz estimates (theorem 2.5) $v \in L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)$. Then by Gronwall's inequality and time reversal symmetry there exist constants $C_1(\|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}}, \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}}, \delta_1)$ and $C_2(\|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}}, \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}}, \delta_1)$ such that

$$E(w(t)) \lesssim C_1(1+|t|)^{C_2}. \tag{4.11}$$

Notice that this implies that for any compact interval $J \subset \mathbf{R}$,

$$\|w\|_{L^4_{t,x}(J\times\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|v\|_{L^4_{t,x}(J\times\mathbf{R}^3)} < \infty. \tag{4.12}$$

This proves the theorem. □

5 Hyperbolic coordinates

In this section we prove

Theorem 5.1 *The global solution given in theorem* 4.1 *scatters both forward and backward in time.*

Proof: By time reversal symmetry and (1.13), it suffices to show that

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty u(t,r)^4 r^2 drdt < \infty. \tag{5.1}$$

First we make a translation in time so that $t_0 = 0$ maps to $t_0 = 1-\delta_1$. Theorem 4.1 implies that

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^\infty u(t,r)^4 r^2 dr dt < \infty. \tag{5.2}$$

Next, by small data arguments (see for example [11]), the solution to (1.1) with initial data given by (3.14), has finite $L^4_{t,x}$ norm. Then by finite propagation speed this implies

$$\int_1^\infty \int_{r>\frac{1}{2}+t} u(t,r)^4 r^2 dr dt \lesssim \epsilon_0. \tag{5.3}$$

It therefore remains to prove

$$\int_1^\infty \int_{r\leq\frac{1}{2}+t} u(t,r)^4 r^2 dr dt < \infty. \tag{5.4}$$

It is convenient to compute this norm in hyperbolic coordinates.

$$\tilde{w}(\tau,s) = \frac{e^\tau \sinh s}{s} w(e^\tau \cosh s, e^\tau \sinh s), \tag{5.5}$$

$$\tilde{v}(\tau,s) = \frac{e^\tau \sinh s}{s} v(e^\tau \cosh s, e^\tau \sinh s), \tag{5.6}$$

and

$$\tilde{u}(\tau,s) = \frac{e^\tau \sinh s}{s} u(e^\tau \cosh s, e^\tau \sinh s). \tag{5.7}$$

Then $\tilde{w}$ solves the nonlinear wave equation

$$\partial_{\tau\tau}\tilde{w} - \partial_{ss}\tilde{w} - \frac{2}{s}\partial_s \tilde{w} = -(\frac{s}{\sinh s})^2 \tilde{u}^3. \tag{5.8}$$

We begin by showing that $\tilde{w}$ has finite hyperbolic energy.

Lemma 5.2 *There exists some $0 < \tau < \delta_1$ such that*

$$E(\tilde{w}(\tau)) < \infty, \tag{5.9}$$

where $E(\tilde{w}(\tau))$ is the hyperbolic energy

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_0^\infty \tilde{w}_s(\tau,s)^2 s^2 ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\infty \tilde{w}_\tau(\tau,s)^2 s^2 ds + \frac{1}{4}\int_0^\infty (\frac{s}{\sinh s})^2 \tilde{w}(\tau,s)^4 s^2 ds. \tag{5.10}$$

Proof: When $\tau = 0$,

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} e^\tau \cosh s - e^\tau \sinh s = 1. \tag{5.11}$$

Combining

$$v(t) = S(t)\chi(\frac{10x}{\delta_1})(u_0, u_1) + \int_0^{\delta/10} S(t-\tau)\chi(\frac{10x}{\delta_1})F(u(\tau))d\tau \tag{5.12}$$

with finite propagation speed, there exists some s_0 such that

$$\int_{s_0}^{\infty} s^2\tilde{w}_s(\tau,s)^2ds + \int_{s_0}^{\infty} s^2\tilde{w}_\tau(\tau,s)ds = \int_{s_0}^{\infty} s^2\tilde{u}_s(\tau,s)^2ds + \int_{s_0}^{\infty} s^2\tilde{u}_\tau(\tau,s)ds. \tag{5.13}$$

Now by standard properties of the wave equation, remembering that $t_0 = 1-\delta_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} s\tilde{u}(\tau,s) = \frac{1}{2}(e^{\tau+s} - (1-\delta_1))u_0(e^{\tau+s} - (1-\delta_1)) + \frac{1}{2}(1-\delta_1 - e^{\tau-s})u_0(1-\delta_1-e^{\tau-s}) \\ + \frac{1}{2}\int_{e^{\tau-s}+(1-\delta_1)}^{e^{\tau+s}-(1-\delta_1)} u_1(r)rdr + \frac{1}{2}\int_{1-\delta_1}^{e^\tau \cosh s}\int_{-e^{\tau-s}+t}^{e^{\tau+s}-t} ru^3(t,r)drdt. \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\tau+s}(s\tilde{u}(\tau,s))|_{\tau=0} = \frac{1}{2}e^s u_0(e^s-(1-\delta_1)) \\ + \frac{1}{2}e^s(e^s-(1-\delta_1))u_0'(e^s-(1-\delta_1)) \\ + \frac{e^s}{2}(e^s-(1-\delta_1))u_1(e^s-(1-\delta_1)) \\ + \frac{e^s}{2}\int_{1-\delta_1}^{\cosh s}(e^s-t)u^3(t,e^s-t)dt, \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\tau-s}(s\tilde{u}(\tau,s))|_{\tau=0} = \frac{1}{2}e^{-s}u_0((1-\delta_1)-e^{-s}) \\ + \frac{e^{-s}}{2}((1-\delta_1)-e^{-s})u_0'((1-\delta_1)-e^{-s}) \\ + \frac{e^{-s}}{2}((1-\delta_1)-e^{-s})u_1((1-\delta_1)-e^{-s}) \\ + \frac{e^{-s}}{2}\int_{1-\delta_1}^{e^\tau\cosh s}(t-e^{-s})u^3(t,t-e^{-s})dt. \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

First, making a change of variables and using (3.38) - (3.44),

$$\int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{2s}u_0(e^s-(1-\delta_1))^2ds \lesssim \int_0^{\infty} u_0(r)^2rdr < \infty, \tag{5.17}$$

$$\int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{2s}(e^s-(1-\delta_1))^2u_0'(e^s-(1-\delta_1))^2ds \lesssim \int_0^{\infty}(\partial_r u_0(r))^2r^3dr < \infty, \tag{5.18}$$

and

$$\int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{2s}(e^s-(1-\delta_1))^2 u_1(e^s-(1-\delta_1))^2 ds \lesssim \int_0^{\infty} r^3 u_1(r)^2 dr < \infty. \quad (5.19)$$

Also, by (3.38) - (3.44) combined with the fact that $\cosh s - \sinh s \geq \frac{1}{2}$ when $s \geq s_0$, (5.2), and (5.3),

$$\int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{2s}(\int_{1-\delta_1}^{\cosh s}(e^s-t)u^3(t,e^s-t)dt)^2 ds \lesssim \int_{s_0}^{\infty}\int_{1-\delta_1}^{\cosh s} e^{3s}(e^s-t)^2 u^6(t,e^s-t)dtds < \infty. \quad (5.20)$$

$$\int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{-2s} u_0((1-\delta_1)-e^{-s})^2 ds \lesssim \int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{-2s} ds < \infty. \quad (5.21)$$

$$\int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{-2s}((1-\delta_1)-e^{-s})^2 (u_0'((1-\delta_1)-e^{-s}))^2 ds \lesssim \int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{-2s} ds < \infty. \quad (5.22)$$

$$\int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{-2s}((1-\delta_1)-e^{-s})^2 u_1((1-\delta_1)-e^{-s})^2 ds \lesssim \int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{-2s} ds < \infty. \quad (5.23)$$

Also by (3.38) - (3.44),

$$\int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{-2s}(\int_{1-\delta_1}^{e^\tau \cosh s}(t-e^{-s})u^3(t,t-e^{-s})dt)^2 ds \lesssim \int_{s_0}^{\infty} e^{-2s} ds < \infty. \quad (5.24)$$

In fact the above computations could be made for any $0 < \tau < \delta_1$ with some uniform s_0. So to prove the lemma it suffices to show that

$$\int_0^{\delta_1}\int_0^{s_0} s^2 \tilde{w}_s(\tau,s)^2 ds d\tau + \int_0^{\delta_1}\int_0^{s_0} s^2 \tilde{w}_\tau(\tau,s) ds d\tau. \quad (5.25)$$

This fact is an immediate consequence of (5.5), theorem 4.1, and the fact that $e^\tau \sinh s$ and $e^\tau \cosh s$ are uniformly bounded when $s \leq s_0$ and $\tau \leq \delta_1$. Thus, for some $0 < \tau_0 < \delta_1$,

$$\int_0^{\infty} s^2 \tilde{w}_s(\tau_0,s)^2 ds + \int_0^{\infty} s^2 \tilde{w}_\tau(\tau_0,s) ds < \infty. \quad (5.26)$$

Then an application of the Sobolev embedding theorem completes the proof of lemma 5.2. □

Next we compute

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}E(\tilde{w}(\tau)) = \int \tilde{w}_\tau[\tilde{u}^3 - \tilde{w}^3](\frac{s}{\sinh s})^2 s^2 ds. \tag{5.27}$$

By the support properties of v and the definition of $\tilde{v}$,

$$\|\tilde{w}_\tau(\tau)\|_{L^2}\|\tilde{v}(\tau,s)^2(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^2}\|\tilde{v}(\tau,s)(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim e^{-\tau/2}E(\tilde{w}(\tau))^{1/2}\|\tilde{v}(\tau,s)^2(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^2}. \tag{5.28}$$

Meanwhile,

$$\|\tilde{w}_\tau(\tau)\|_{L^2}\|\tilde{v}(\tau,s)(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^\infty}\|\tilde{w}(\tau,s)^2(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^2} \lesssim E(\tilde{w}(\tau))e^{-\tau/2}, \tag{5.29}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{w}_\tau(\tau)\|_{L^2}\|\tilde{v}(\tau,s)(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^\infty}\|\tilde{w}(\tau,s)(\frac{s}{\sinh s})^{1/2}\|_{L^4}\|\tilde{v}(\tau,s)(\frac{s}{\sinh s})^{1/2}\|_{L^4}& \\ \lesssim e^{-\tau/2}E(\tilde{w}(\tau))^{3/4}\|\tilde{v}(\tau,s)(\frac{s}{\sinh s})^{1/2}\|_{L^4}.&\end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

Now by a change of variables

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty \tilde{v}(\tau,s)^4 s^2(\frac{s}{\sinh s})^2 ds d\tau \\ =\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty &\frac{e^{4\tau}(\sinh s)^4}{s^4}(\frac{s^4}{(\sinh s)^2})v(e^\tau\cosh s, e^\tau\sinh s)^4 ds d\tau \\ &= \int\int_{t^2-r^2\geq 1} v(t,r)^4 r^2 dr dt.\end{aligned} \tag{5.31}$$

Therefore, since $\|v\|_{L^4_{t,x}} < \infty$, Gronwall's inequality implies that $E(\tilde{w}(\tau))$ is uniformly bounded on $\mathbf{R}$.

Next we prove the Morawetz estimate.

Theorem 5.3

$$\int\int \tilde{w}(s,\tau)^4(\frac{s}{\sinh s})^2 s^2 ds d\tau < \infty. \tag{5.32}$$

Proof: Let

$$M(\tau) = \int \tilde{w}_\tau(\frac{x}{|x|}\cdot\nabla\tilde{w})dx. \tag{5.33}$$

Then

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}M(\tau) = \int(\frac{\cosh s}{\sinh s})(\frac{s}{\sinh s})^2\tilde{w}^4 s^2 ds + \int\frac{x}{|x|}\cdot(\nabla\tilde{w})(\tilde{u}^3-\tilde{w}^3)s^2 ds d\tau. \tag{5.34}$$

As in the bounded energy computations,

$$\|\tilde{w}_s\|_{L^2}\|\tilde{v}^2(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^2}\|\tilde{v}(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim e^{-\tau/2}E(w(\tau))^{1/2}\|\tilde{v}^2(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^2}, \tag{5.35}$$

$$\|w_s\|_{L^\infty}\|\tilde{v}(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^\infty}\|\tilde{w}^2(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^2} \lesssim E(\tilde{w})e^{-\tau/2}, \tag{5.36}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|w_s\|_{L^\infty}\|\tilde{v}(\frac{s}{\sinh s})\|_{L^\infty}\|\tilde{w}(\frac{s}{\sinh s})^{1/2}\|_{L^4}\|\tilde{v}(\frac{s}{\sinh s})^{1/2}\|_{L^4} \\ \lesssim E(\tilde{w})^{3/4}e^{-\tau/2}\|\tilde{v}(\frac{s}{\sinh s})^{1/2}\|_{L^4}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.37}$$

Therefore, by the fundamental theorem of calculus, the fact that the energy is uniformly bounded, and (5.34),

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \tilde{w}(s,\tau)^4(\frac{s}{\sinh s})^2 s^2 ds d\tau < \infty. \tag{5.38}$$

□

Then by the change of variables in (5.31), (5.38) implies

$$\int\int_{t^2-r^2\geq 1} w(t,r)^4 r^2 dr dt < \infty. \tag{5.39}$$

Finally, by theorem 4.1,

$$\int_1^\infty \int_{t^2-r^2\geq 1, t-r\leq \frac{1}{2}} u(t,r)^4 r^2 dr dt < \infty. \tag{5.40}$$

Combining (5.2), (5.3), (5.31), (5.39), and (5.40),

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty u(t,r)^4 r^2 dr dt < \infty. \tag{5.41}$$

This proves theorem 5.1. □

Remark: Notice that theorem 5.1 implies that

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty u(t,r)^4 r^2 dr dt \leq C(\|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}}, \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}}, \delta_1) < \infty. \tag{5.42}$$

Thus theorem 5.1 is not equivalent to theorem 1.4. This $\delta_1 > 0$ depends on the support of u_0 and u_1 in space (3.14) and in frequency (3.2). To remove this requirement, it is necessary make a profile decomposition, the subject of the final section of this paper.

6 Profile decomposition

Observe that the difficulty in going theorem 5.1 to theorem 1.4 lies in the fact that even if most of the $B^2_{1,1} \times B^1_{1,1}$ norm lies below frequency one, guaranteeing local well - posedness on an interval of length 2δ (lemma 3.1), the R appearing in (3.14) could be very large, and thus after rescaling, $\delta_1 > 0$ could be quite small.

However, the intuition guiding an important refinement utilizes finite propagation speed. Indeed, if (u_0, u_1) were radial functions supported on the annulus $R \leq r \leq 2R$, R large, then the $\dot{H}^{1/2}$ norm on balls of radius cR for some $c > 0$ small would actually be fairly small. Therefore, one could then apply the small data arguments of [11] to prove the result of lemma 3.1 actually holds on an interval of length $\sim R$.

By the uncertainty principle, when most of the $B^2_{1,1} \times B^1_{1,1}$ lies below frequency one we have $R \gtrsim 1$. Utilizing a by now standard profile decomposition argument, it is possible to show that the above argument can refine theorem 5.1 when $R >> 1$, thus proving theorem 1.4. A key ingredient is the profile decomposition of [12].

Theorem 6.1 (Profile decomposition) *Suppose that there is a uniformly bounded, radially symmetric sequence*

$$\|u_0^n\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1^n\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq C_0 < \infty. \tag{6.1}$$

Then there exists a subsequence, also denoted $(u_0^n, u_1^n) \subset \dot{H}^{1/2} \times \dot{H}^{-1/2}$ *such that for any* $N < \infty$*,*

$$S(t)(u_0^n, u_1^n) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Gamma_j^n S(t)(\phi_0^j, \phi_1^j) + S(t)(R_{0,n}^N, R_{1,n}^N), \tag{6.2}$$

with

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \|S(t)(R_{0,n}^N, R_{1,n}^N)\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} = 0. \tag{6.3}$$

Γ_j^n *is the action of the group* $(0,\infty) \times \mathbf{R}$*,*

$$\Gamma_j^n F(t,x) = \lambda_j^n F(\lambda_j^n (t - t_n^j), \lambda_j^n x). \tag{6.4}$$

Additionally, for every $j \neq k$*,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\lambda_j^n}{\lambda_k^n} + \frac{\lambda_k^n}{\lambda_j^n} + (\lambda_n^j)^{1/2}(\lambda_n^k)^{1/2}|t_j^n - t_k^n| = \infty. \tag{6.5}$$

Furthermore, for every $N \geq 1$*,*

$$\|(u_{0,n}, u_{1,n})\|^2_{\dot{H}^{1/2}\times\dot{H}^{-1/2}} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \|(\phi_0^j, \phi_0^k)\|^2_{\dot{H}^{1/2}\times\dot{H}^{-1/2}} + \|(R^N_{0,n}, R^N_{1,n})\|^2_{\dot{H}^{1/2}\times\dot{H}^{-1/2}} + o_n(1). \tag{6.6}$$

Remark: [12] proved this result for data which need not be radially symmetric. Such a result is substantially more difficult since it requires accounting for Lorentz transformations and translation in space. See [5] and [1] for the early development of the profile decomposition.

Now let

$$\begin{aligned} f(M) = \sup\{\|u\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} : u \text{ solves (1.1) with initial data} \\ (u_0, u_1) \in B^2_{1,1} \times B^1_{1,1}, \qquad \|u_0\|_{B^2_{1,1}} + \|u_1\|_{B^1_{1,1}} \leq M\}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

To prove theorem 1.4 it suffices to show that $f(M) < \infty$ for any M.

Remark: Theorem 1.3 implies that such a function is well - defined.

Take a uniformly bounded sequence

$$\|u_0^n\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1^n\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq C_0 < \infty, \tag{6.8}$$

such that if $u^n(t)$ is the solution of (1.1) with initial data (u_0^n, u_1^n), then

$$\|u^n(t)\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \to f(C_0). \tag{6.9}$$

By the Sobolev embedding theorem

$$\|u_0^n\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1^n\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u_0^n\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1^n\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq C_0 < \infty, \tag{6.10}$$

which by theorem 6.1 gives a profile decomposition

$$S(t)(u_0^n, u_1^n) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} S(t - t_n^j)(\lambda_n^j \phi_0^j(\lambda_n^j x), (\lambda_n^j)^2 \phi_1^j(\lambda_n^j x)) + S(t)(R^N_{0,n}, R^N_{1,n}). \tag{6.11}$$

In the course of proving theorem 6.1, [12] proved

$$S(-\frac{t_n^j}{\lambda_n^j})(\frac{1}{\lambda_n^j} u_0^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}), \frac{1}{(\lambda_n^j)^2} u_1^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j})) \rightharpoonup \phi_0^j(x) \tag{6.12}$$

weakly in $\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)$, and

$$\partial_t S(t-\frac{t_n^j}{\lambda_n^j})(\frac{1}{\lambda_n^j}u_0^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}),\frac{1}{(\lambda_n^j)^2}u_1^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}))|_{t=0} \rightharpoonup \phi_0^j(x) \tag{6.13}$$

weakly in $\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)$.

Lemma 6.2 *For each j, $\frac{t_n^j}{\lambda_n^j}$ is uniformly bounded.*

Proof: By the dispersive estimates (theorem 2.4), for any $l \in \mathbf{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|P_l S(t-\frac{t_n^j}{\lambda_n^j})((\lambda_n^j)^{-1}u_0^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}),(\lambda_n^j)^{-2}u_1^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}))\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^3)} \\ \lesssim \frac{1}{|t-\frac{t_n^j}{\lambda_n^j}|}&[2^{2l}\|P_l((\lambda_n^j)^{-1}u_0^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j})\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}+2^l\|P_l((\lambda_n^j)^{-2}u_1^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}))\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

Meanwhile, by Bernstein's inequality and the Sobolev embedding theorem

$$\begin{aligned} &\|P_l S(t-\frac{t_n^j}{\lambda_n^j})((\lambda_n^j)^{-1}u_0^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}),(\lambda_n^j)^{-2}u_1^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}))\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)} \\ \lesssim 2^{-l/2}&[2^{2l}\|P_l((\lambda_n^j)^{-1}u_0^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j})\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}+2^l\|P_l((\lambda_n^j)^{-2}u_1^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}))\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

Then by interpolation, for any $l \in \mathbf{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|P_l S(t-\frac{t_n^j}{\lambda_n^j})((\lambda_n^j)^{-1}u_0^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}),(\lambda_n^j)^{-2}u_1^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}))\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\{|t-\frac{t_n^j}{\lambda_n^j}|>C2^{-l}\}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \\ \lesssim \frac{1}{C^{1/4}}&[2^{2l}\|P_l((\lambda_n^j)^{-1}u_0^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j})\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}+2^l\|P_l((\lambda_n^j)^{-2}u_1^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}))\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^3)}]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

Then if $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{|t_n^j|}{\lambda_n^j}=\infty$, then possibly after passing to a subsequence,

$$S(t-\frac{t_n^j}{\lambda_n^j})((\lambda_n^j)^{-1}u_0^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j}),(\lambda_n^j)^{-2}u_1^n(\frac{x}{\lambda_n^j})) \rightharpoonup 0 \tag{6.17}$$

weakly in $L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)$. Utilizing lemma 4.1 from [12],

Lemma 6.3

$$(u_{0,n},u_{1,n}) \rightharpoonup (\phi_0,\phi_1) \tag{6.18}$$

weakly in $\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)\times\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)$ is equivalent to

$$S(t)(u_{0,n},u_{1,n}) \rightharpoonup S(t)(\phi_0,\phi_1) \tag{6.19}$$

weakly in $L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)$.

Therefore (6.17) implies $(\phi_0^j, \phi_1^j) = (0,0)$. $\square$

Therefore $\frac{|t_n^j|}{\lambda_n^j}$ is uniformly bounded, so after passing to a subsequence, $\frac{t_n^j}{\lambda_n^j}$ converges to some $t_0^j \in \mathbf{R}$. Then

$$S(\frac{t_n^j}{\lambda_n^j})(\phi_0^j, \phi_1^j) \to S(t_0^j)(\phi_0^j, \phi_1^j) \tag{6.20}$$

strongly in $\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)$. Absorbing the error into $(R_{0,n}^N, R_{1,n}^N)$ and taking

$$(\tilde{\phi}_0^j, \tilde{\phi}_1^j) = S(t_0^j)(\phi_0, \phi_1), \tag{6.21}$$

we can assume $t_n^j \equiv 0$. Therefore,

$$(u_0^n, u_1^n) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} (\lambda_n^j \phi_0^j(\lambda_n^j x), (\lambda_n^j)^2 \phi_1^j(\lambda_n^j x)) + (R_{0,n}^N, R_{1,n}^N), \tag{6.22}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\lambda_j^n}{\lambda_k^n} + \frac{\lambda_k^n}{\lambda_j^n} = \infty. \tag{6.23}$$

But then

$$\|u_0^n\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|u_1^n\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq C_0 < \infty \tag{6.24}$$

combined with lemma 6.3, (6.22), and (6.23) implies that for any j,

$$\|\phi_0^j\|_{B^2_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|\phi_1^j\|_{B^1_{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq C_0. \tag{6.25}$$

Possibly reordering j, (6.6) implies that there exists $N_0(\epsilon, C_0)$ such that if $j \geq N_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\|(\phi_0^j, \phi_1^j)\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}\times\dot{H}^{-1/2}} < \epsilon. \tag{6.26}$$

Now for each j let $v^j(t,x)$ be the solution of (1.1) with initial data (ϕ_0^j, ϕ_1^j). By the small data arguments of [11], when $j \geq N_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\|v^j\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|\phi_0^j\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|\phi_1^j\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{6.27}$$

Meanwhile, by theorem 5.1 combined with (6.25), when $j \leq N_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\|v^j\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim_{j,C_0} 1. \tag{6.28}$$

Also by (6.23), for any $j \neq k$, the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem implies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int\int |\lambda_n^j v^j(\lambda_n^j t,\lambda_n^j x)|^2|\lambda_n^k v^k(\lambda_n^k t,\lambda_n^k x)|^2 dxdt = 0. \tag{6.29}$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\|\sum_{1\le j\le N}\lambda_n^j v^j(\lambda_n^j t,\lambda_n^j x)\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \tag{6.30}$$

is uniformly bounded, independent of N. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} &F(\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_n^j v^j(\lambda_n^j t,\lambda_n^j x)) - \sum_{j=1}^N F(\lambda_n^j v^j(\lambda_n^j t,\lambda_n^j x)) \\ &= \sum_{1\le j\ne k\le N} O(|\lambda_n^j v^j(\lambda_n^j t,\lambda_n^j x)||\lambda_n^k v^k(\lambda_n^k t,\lambda_n^k x)|^2), \end{aligned} \tag{6.31}$$

so by (6.28), (6.29), and (6.30),

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\|F(\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_n^j v^j(\lambda_n^j t,\lambda_n^j x)) - \sum_{j=1}^N F(\lambda_n^j v^j(\lambda_n^j t,\lambda_n^j x))\|_{L^{4/3}_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} = 0. \tag{6.32}$$

Therefore, by lemma 2.6, the solution $u_N^n(t,x)$ to (1.1) with initial data

$$\sum_{j=1}^N (\lambda_n^j \phi_0^j(\lambda_n^j x), (\lambda_n^j)^2\phi_1^j(\lambda_n^j x)) \tag{6.33}$$

has

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\|u_N^n(t)\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \tag{6.34}$$

bounded uniformly in N. By another application of lemma 2.6 combined with

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|S(t)(R_{0,n}^N, R_{1,n}^N)\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} = 0, \tag{6.35}$$

if $u^n(t)$ is the solution to (1.1) with initial data (u_0^n, u_1^n) satisfying (6.1), then

$$\|u^n(t)\|_{L^4_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^3)} \tag{6.36}$$

is uniformly bounded. This proves theorem 1.4. □

References

[1] H. Bahouri and P. Gerard, "High frequency approximation of solutions to critical nonlinear wave equations", *American Journal of Mathematics* **121** 1 (1999) 131 – 175.

[2] J. Colliander, M. Christ, and T. Tao, "Asymptotics, frequency modulation, and low regularity ill - posedness for canonical defocusing equations", *American Journal of Mathematics* **125** 6 (2003) 1235 – 1293.

[3] B. Dodson, "Global well-posedness and scattering for the radial, defocusing, cubic wave equation with almost sharp initial data", Preprint, arXiv:1604.04255.

[4] B. Dodson and A. Lawrie, "Scattering for the radial 3d cubic wave equation", *Analysis and PDE* **8** (2015) 467 – 497.

[5] P. Gerard, "Description du defaut de compacite de l'injection de Sobolev (Description of the lack of compactness a Sobolev embedding)", *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. 3* **3** (1998) 213 – 233.

[6] V. Georgiev, H. Lindblad, and C. Sogge, "Weighted Strichartz estimates and global existence for semilinear wave equations", *American Journal of Mathematics* **119** (1997) 1291 – 1319.

[7] J. Ginibre and G. Velo "Generalized Strichartz inequalities for the wave equation", *Journal of Functional Analysis* **133** 1 (1995) 50 – 68.

[8] M. Grillakis, "Regularity and asymptotic behaviour of the wave equation with critical nonlinearity", *Annals of Mathematics* 132 (1990) 485 – 509.

[9] C. Kenig, *Lectures on the Energy - Critical Nonlinear Wave Equation*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics **122** Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 2015.

[10] C. Kenig and F. Merle, "Global well - posedness, scattering and blow - up for the energy - critical focusing non - linear wave equation", *Acta Mathematica* **201** 2 (2008) 147 – 212.

[11] H. Lindblad and C. Sogge, "On existence and scattering with minimal regularity for semilinear wave equations", *Journal of Functional Analysis* **130** (1995) 357 – 426.

[12] J. Ramos, "A refinement of the Strichartz inequality for the wave equation with applications", *Advances in Mathematics* **230** (2012) 649 – 698.

[13] R. Shen, "Scattering of solutions to the defocusing energy sub - critical semi - linear wave equation in 3D", Preprint, arXiv:1512.00705.

[14] H. Smith and C. Sogge, "Global Strichartz estimates for non trapping perturbations of the Laplacian", *Communications in PDE* **25** (2000) 2171 – 2183.

[15] R. S. Strichartz, "Restrictions of Fourier transforms to quadratic surfaces and decay of solutions of wave equations", *Duke Mathematical Journal* **44** no. 3 (1977) 705 - 714.

[16] T. Tao, *Nonlinear Dispersive Equations. Local and Global Analysis*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics **104** Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 2006.

[17] D. Tataru, "Strichartz estimates in the hyperbolic space and global existence for the semilinear wave equation", *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **353** no. 2 (2000) 795 - 807.